

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Introduction

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed June 2, 2006. By this paper, claims 93 and 98 are amended. Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Examiner Interview

Applicants express their appreciation to the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative on August 21, 2006. This response includes the substance of the interview.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claim 93 in that "the current a result of a body capacitance of the apparatus and a voltage of the power line" is not clear. Claim 93 has been amended to overcome the objection as discussed at the interview.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 93-95 and 98-99 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,933,835 (*Kline*). As discussed at the interview and memorialized in the Interview Summary, claims 93-95 and 98-99 are not taught or suggested by the cited art.

The Office Action suggests that *Kline* teaches mounting the apparatus such that a current flow occurs between the power line and a conductive portion of the apparatus. As discussed the interview, however, *Kline* teaches an inductor that "communicates data signals with medium

voltage power line 120 via magnetic coupling". *See* col. 8, lines 18-20. Claim 93, in contrast, does not require magnetic coupling but requires, among other things, "connecting a first terminal of the power supply to the conductive portion such that a primary current flows between said power line and a body capacitance of the conductive portion of said apparatus."

The magnetic coupling taught by *Kline* fails to teach or suggest connecting a first terminal of the power supply to the conductive portion such that a primary current flows between said power line and a body capacitance of the conductive portion of said apparatus.

For at least these reasons and for the reasons discussed at the interview, *Kline* fails to teach or suggest claim 93, which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 94-95 depend from claim 93 and are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Claim 98 has been amended to require that the first means is connected to said conductive body and operative to be connected to said power line for converting current flow between said power line and said conductive body to a supply of power at a voltage substantially lower than said high AC line voltage.

As discussed at the interview and discussed above, *Kline* requires a magnetic coupling to the power line. *See* col. 8, lines 18-20. Claim 98 requires the first means be connected to said conductive body. The second means are also required to be connected to said supply of power for performing an electronic function. As discussed at the interview and memorialized in the Interview Summary, the magnetic coupling taught by *Kline* fails to teach or suggest, among other things, the requirement that the first means be connected to said conductive body and operative to be connected to said power line. Further, claim 98 requires that the current results from the body capacitance whereas the current taught in *Kline* is due to the magnetic coupling.

As noted in the Interview Summary, claims 98-99 now overcome the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 98-99 are also in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-92, 96-96, and 100-102 are allowed and that the withdrawn claims have rejoined the application. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful review of these claims. While Applicant agrees that these claim are allowable, Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of

the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicant does not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that the claims as presented herein are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 25th day of August 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl T. Reed/ Reg. #45454
CARL T. REED

Registration No. 45,454
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800